

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the President's top political adviser stated, and I quote, "Liberals saw the savagery of the 9/11 attacks and wanted to prepare indictments and offer therapy and understanding for our attackers."

This statement is offensive, divisive, and patently false.

Three days after those barbaric attacks, this House voted 420 to 1 to use all necessary and appropriate force against those responsible.

The Senate passed the same measure 98 to 0.

I do not know whether Mr. Rove's statement was calculated to exploit collective national pain for partisan political gain, although his slash-and-burn track record speaks for itself.

But Mr. Rove should apologize and retract it. And the President of the United States, who represents not Republicans, not Democrats, but all Americans, should repudiate it today.

The President came to office stating he wanted to change the tone in Washington. Today, today he can demonstrate that he meant it.

FIFTH AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would read part of the United States Constitution. Maybe the folks down the street at the Supreme Court will hear part of it.

No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. This is the fifth amendment of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker.

This simple amendment does not permit government to take our homes and give it to some private entity, some private developer to build a parking lot. But yet the Supreme Court yesterday misinterpreted this simple provision in our Constitution; and now a private corporation, with the aid of government, can take our homes without our consent and build some shopping mall.

This amendment was to protect our homes from others who want to take our land. The purpose of this amendment was for public use, like a school. The Supreme Court once again has got it wrong and allows this modern-day land grabbing by government for big developers without our consent. The Supreme Court, once again, has lost its way.

COMMENTS OF KARL ROVE

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, Republicans began this week when one Mem-

ber accused the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), me, and Democrats in general of being anti-Christian. The gentleman retracted his comments.

They are ending this week with Karl Rove characterizing Democrats as weak in responding to 9/11 and endangering our troops. He needs to retract his remarks.

My district is 40 miles from Ground Zero. Democrats and Republicans died in that rubble. Democrats and Republicans are fighting and dying in Iraq and Afghanistan. Mr. Rove dishonors them by politicizing 9/11. He dishonors our troops by dividing them at a time of war.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago or 3 weeks ago we had the Armed Services markup on the defense authorization. Democrats offered amendment after amendment to strengthen our troops, better force protection, deeper investments, better quality of life for their families. Republicans opposed those amendments because we could not afford it. They said that the tax cuts that Mr. Rove engineered were more important.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rove must repudiate his comments. The President must ask Mr. Rove to repudiate his comments. This is the first administration that I know of that is every day seeking to divide the American people during a time of war.

WORKING TOGETHER TO STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Bush and Republicans are working hard to protect Social Security for today's retirees and strengthen the program for future generations. This week Republicans offered several positive proposals that will help solve the problems plaguing Social Security.

However, to ensure that we find a lasting solution, Democrats should join us at the negotiating table. On Wednesday, The Washington Post editorial page questioned: "Democrats need to ask themselves, now what? Is it enough to keep sticking their fingers in their ears while saying no? Failing to act now will make the problem harder to fix down the road. Cuts or tax increases will have to be steeper the longer the problem goes unaddressed."

President Bush has invited Democrats to share their ideas on Social Security, but unfortunately his request has been met with silence or obstruction. While inaction may be politically safe, it does not help the millions of Americans who rely on Social Security.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

H.R. 3010, LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill we will continue debating later today is a stunning example of the impact that this Congress's misplaced priorities can have on what most consider to be a basic human right, access to a quality education.

With this bill we have made a conscious choice. While we give away tax cuts worth \$140,000 dollars a year to millionaires, families earning \$30,000 a year will not be able to afford sending their children to college. It is an unconscionable choice that defies our values.

The bill turns its back on priorities like No Child Left Behind and IDEA, which have been cut by \$40 billion and \$4 billion respectively, as well as College Work Study and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, which are frozen for the second year in a row.

Before I was elected to Congress, I spent 30 years as a college administrator. I came to understand just how difficult it is for students and their families to afford college.

Every day I worked with them to scrape up the money, grants, scholarships, whatever we could find to help them realize part of the American Dream, the opportunity to earn a college education.

Mr. Speaker, with this bill we have made a conscious choice to provide more comfort for the comfortable at the expense of those who are trying to make a better life for themselves. Our students deserve better.

NEW CITY OF SANDY SPRINGS, GEORGIA

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the new city of Sandy Springs. A celebration that has been 30 years in the making took place in Fulton County, Georgia, on Tuesday night as 94 percent of voters chose to incorporate into what will be Metropolitan Atlanta's second largest city.

Countless people worked long and hard to make this city a possibility. All those folks who put in the time and effort into making the city of Sandy Springs a reality are to be raised up as an example of the positive outcome from fervent belief and diligent commitment.

I have always believed that the government closest to the people is the most responsive. And it is only fair for these citizens to have their local tax dollars to better their own community and have their own city council, one much more attuned to their needs and concerns.

Mr. Speaker, take note: the birth of this new city is a landmark day for my district. I am confident that great things will come from their residents and their leaders. What a privilege it is for me to represent a constituency so involved and passionate about their destiny and that of our State and great Nation. Freedom rings in Sandy Springs.

COMMENTS OF KARL ROVE

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in light of Karl Rove's savage attack on the patriotism of liberals in this country, I have a couple of questions. Two days after 9/11, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I, on a bipartisan basis, pushed a \$20 billion package through this House in response to the attack. We had to sit in the Speaker's office and defend the President's request against people like Phil Graham and Don Nichols of the President's own party. Are those the liberals that Karl Rove was talking about?

One month after 9/11, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I went to the White House and urged the President to support a greatly increased homeland security budget. The President, without even looking at what we were proposing, said, "If you add one dime to our budget for homeland security, I will veto the bill." Mr. Rove was sitting over his shoulder when President Bush made that remark. Is President Bush one of those out-of-line liberals that Mr. Rove is talking about?

I come from the State of Wisconsin. I know a third-rate Joe McCarthy when I see one, and I saw one in Mr. Rove's comments yesterday.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this week I organized a subcommittee visit to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to help our Members learn about efforts to support the DHS mission to prevent bioattacks. We were briefed on aerosolized anthrax and botulinum toxin, among other things, and also the horrible things that terrorists could do with these deadly pathogens.

While the CDC is focusing on how our enemies could attack us, our military is focused on who may attack us. Among those who would attack are those held at Guantanamo Bay. These detainees are a far cry from the innocent millions who lost their lives at the hands of Stalin, Hitler, and the Khmer Rouge. These are terrorists who would put the botulinum toxin I saw on Monday in the food our families eat. If we had specific information this bio-weapon was about to be used in one of

our towns or cities, we would not hesitate to question and detain those we believed had information on such a plot. And that is exactly how we must always act because we are certain there are enemies out there that mean us grave harm. The American people expect us to be uncompromising in our mission to ensure the security of our citizens.

PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I do not know what it is about the Republicans, but despite overwhelming opposition by the American people across the board against the privatization of Social Security, they bring out yet another plan to privatize Social Security. They bring out another plan to privatize Social Security, to raid the Social Security trust fund, and to undermine the solvency of Social Security.

Three points to their plan. Undermine the solvency of Social Security; raid what is left of the Social Security trust fund; and to privatize Social Security, all of which the American public overwhelmingly disagrees with and has disagreed with whether it is presented by the President or by the Republicans in Congress.

A Republican got up here a few minutes ago and said we want to do this because these people can spend their money better than the government. I would remind that young woman that she is the government. The Republicans control the White House, the House and the Senate. And since they have controlled those three bodies, they have taken \$700 billion out of the Social Security trust fund; \$700 billion they have raided to date, and now they want to close the deal and take the rest of the money out of the Social Security trust fund.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 3010, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 337 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3010.

□ 0918

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. PUTNAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 23, 2005, the amendment by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 69, line 19.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have been concerned about a program known as Youth Build, which I know many Members are familiar with, which is a very good program which gets young people in urban areas and elsewhere to learn how to build houses. And the results are some very nice houses for deserving people, and an improvement of a neighborhood, and most importantly, skills for these young people.

Now, we ran into a little difficulty. It is not one of the more expensive of our programs although it has been, at \$60 million, not nothing. The President in his budget proposed I think \$50 million for it, but proposed that instead of being funded out of the HUD budget it be transferred to the Labor Department's budget. That led to, I guess, it falling between the cracks of the two appropriate subcommittees; so that while I understand there is support for the program and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), a former chairman of the HUD subcommittee, tells me that he strongly supports it, and I understand there was a very close vote in the Appropriations Committee on an amendment to put it back into the bill, both bills now come to the floor without that appropriation for Youth Build. And I think this is a case of something not being rejected on the merits, or not being something we cannot afford, but something that has sort of fallen through the cracks because of this proposed change in where it goes.

So I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee, given the, I believe, support, it was in the President's budget, there was virtually a tie vote in the Appropriations Committee, could the gentleman tell me, is there some hope